

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/988,585	Applicant(s) HORIKOSHI ET AL.	
	Examiner Thien Tran	Art Unit 2811	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thien Tran. (3) _____.

(2) Larry Anagnos. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 July 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We discussed the amendment made in the reply filed on 06/27/2003 and we discussed the difference of the glass substrate defined in the claims versus those in the prior art references. An affidavit may be helpful in this matter. It was agreed the limitation regarding the glass substrate is directed to the physical properties of the glass substrate itself. The examiner will consider the claims further upon formally reviewing the amendment filed on 06/27/2003. However, the amendment will not be entered because claim 1 changes the scope of the dependent claim 22 thereof and newly added language to independent claim 9 changes the scope of claims 9 and 11 which requires further consideration and/or search .